

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Rose Lantigua (S14)	Team: Squad #14	CCRB Case #: 201706746	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Force	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) NA, __/__/2017 12:00 AM	Location of Incident: Various	Precinct: 120	18 Mo. SOL 7/1/2018	EO SOL 7/1/2018	
Date/Time CV Reported Tue, 08/15/2017 3:51 PM	CV Reported At: Mayor's Office	How CV Reported: On-line website	Date/Time Received at CCRB Tue, 08/15/2017 3:51 PM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. Officers			431
2. Officers			430
3. Officers			Unknown
4. Officers			120 PCT
5. POM Aaron Espada	09222	953235	120 PCT

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A. Officers	Abuse: On April 4, 2017, officers entered § 87(2)(b) in Staten Island.	
B. Officers	Abuse: On June 6, 2017, officers entered § 87(2)(b) in Staten Island.	
C. Officers	Abuse: On June 6, 2017, at the 121st Precinct stationhouse, officers did not obtain medical treatment for § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b)	
D. Officers	Off. Language: On June 6, 2017, en route to and at Richmond Criminal Court in Staten Island, an officer made statements to § 87(2)(b) based upon perceived mental illness.	
E. Officers	Discourtesy: On June 6, 2017, en route to Richmond Criminal Court in Staten Island, an officer spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b)	
F.POM Aaron Espada	Abuse: On September 5, 2017, in front of § 87(2)(b) in Staten Island, Police Officer Aaron Espada interfered with § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b) use of a recording device.	
G.POM Aaron Espada	Abuse: On September 5, 2017, in front of § 87(2)(b) in Staten Island, Police Officer Aaron Espada damaged § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b) property.	
H.POM Aaron Espada	Force: On September 5, 2017, in front of § 87(2)(b) in Staten Island, Police Officer Aaron Espada hit § 87(2)(b) against an inanimate object.	
I. Officers	Abuse: On September 5, 2017, at the 120th Precinct stationhouse, officers did not obtain medical treatment for § 87(2)(b)	

Case Summary

On August 15, 2017, § 87(2)(b) filed this complaint via the CCRB's online website on behalf of her nephew, who was ultimately identified as § 87(2)(b) did not witness these incidents.

Between August 18, 2017 and October 25, 2017, § 87(2)(b) was called five times. On August 18, 2017, there was no answer and a voicemail message was left for § 87(2)(b). On August 21, 2017, § 87(2)(b) confirmed her contact information, but refused to provide her mailing address, her nephew's last name, and her nephew's contact information. § 87(2)(b) agreed to ask her nephew to contact the CCRB. On August 23, 2017, § 87(2)(b) said that she was busy with her sick mother and said she would call back but failed to do so. Two unreturned e-mails were sent to § 87(2)(b) on August 21, 2017 and August 28, 2017.

On August 28, 2017, § 87(2)(b) answered her phone and put her nephew on the phone. § 87(2)(b) identified himself, confirmed his contact information, provided a brief phone statement, and scheduled an interview at the CCRB for August 31, 2017. On August 29, 2017, an automated text message reminder was sent to § 87(2)(b). However, on August 31, 2017, § 87(2)(b) failed to appear for his scheduled appointment and did not call in advance to cancel or reschedule. On October 25, 2017, § 87(2)(b) was called at § 87(2)(b)'s phone number. § 87(2)(b) answered and said that § 87(2)(b) could be reached at his cellphone or via e-mail.

On September 1, 2017, § 87(2)(b)'s cellphone number was called. He answered and said he missed his previously scheduled appointment because "something came up" with his grandmother. § 87(2)(b) rescheduled his CCRB interview for September 6, 2017. On September 1, 2017, a text message was sent to § 87(2)(b) with his appointment date, time, and location at his request. On September 4, 2017, an automated text message reminder was also sent to § 87(2)(b). However, on September 6, 2017, § 87(2)(b) failed to appear for his second scheduled appointment and did not call in advance to cancel or reschedule. Between September 20, 2017 and November 3, 2017, § 87(2)(b)'s cellphone number was called five more times, but no voicemail messages could be left for § 87(2)(b) because his mailbox was full.

On September 7, 2017, § 87(2)(b) called the CCRB and left a voice message stating that he was arrested again and "mistreated" and that his cellphone had been damaged during the incident. § 87(2)(b) requested a call back at a different phone number.

Between September 8, 2017 and October 25, 2017, § 87(2)(b) was called five times at that third phone number. On September 8, 2017, § 87(2)(b) answered and reiterated that he missed his previously scheduled appointment because he was arrested again. He provided a brief phone statement regarding that incident and rescheduled his CCRB interview for September 11, 2017. However, on September 11, 2017, § 87(2)(b) failed to appear for his third scheduled appointment and did not call in advance to cancel or reschedule. On September 22, 2017, § 87(2)(b) answered and said that he has not been able to make it to the CCRB for his scheduled appointments and that he wished to reschedule them but could not do so at the time because he was busy. On October 25, 2017, § 87(2)(b) was called at that third phone

number, and a voicemail message was left for him. On October 26 2017, § 87(2)(b) called and rescheduled his CCRB interview for October 31, 2017. However, on October 31, 2017, § 87(2)(b) sent an e-mail time stamped one minute after his scheduled appointment stating that he needed to reschedule his appointment due to a last minute call from work. That same day, a reply was e-mailed to § 87(2)(b) instructing him to call the CCRB to reschedule his interview. § 87(2)(b) was called two more times on November 2, 2017 and November 3, 2017, but there was no answer either time and no voicemail message could be left because his mailbox was full.

On September 27, 2017 and October 24, 2017, two unreturned letters and two unreturned e-mails were sent to § 87(2)(b)

A search of the NYC Department of Correction Inmate Lookup database conducted on November 22, 2017, confirmed that § 87(2)(b) is not incarcerated. To date, § 87(2)(b) has missed three scheduled appointments and he has not contacted the CCRB further to pursue this complaint. § 87(2)(g)

Squad: 14

Investigator:	_____	_____	_____
	Signature	Print	Date

Squad Leader:	_____	_____	_____
	Title/Signature	Print	Date